

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **December 3, 2003**, the examiner reviewed claims 1-29. Claims 1-4, 6-8, 9-15, 16-17, 19-24, 26-27, and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Kaizuka et al (USPN 6,396,507, hereinafter "Kaizuka"). Claims 5, 15 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaizuka in view of Hanson et al (USPub 2003/0098845, hereinafter "Hanson"). Claims 8, 18, and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaizuka in view of Jogo (USPub 2001/0048447, hereinafter "Jogo").

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Dependent claims 8, 18, and 28 were rejected as being unpatentable over Kaizuka in view of Jogo. Applicant respectfully points out that Jogo teaches **adjusting crop boundaries** on an image while maintaining an aspect ratio (see Jogo, page 6, paragraph [0074]).

In contrast, the present invention teaches **reducing the magnification factor** of an image proportionate to the drag speed of the magnifier (see page 7, lines 20-24 and claims 8, 18, and 28 of the instant application). Adjusting crop boundaries on an image is not the same as reducing the magnification factor of an image proportionate to the drag speed of the magnifier. In fact, Jogo does not teach either dragging the image or changing the magnification of the image. There is nothing within Kaizuka or Jogo, either separately or in concert, which suggests reducing the magnification factor of an image proportionate to the drag speed of the magnifier.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 10, and 20 include the limitations from claims 8, 18, and 28, respectively, to clarify that the present invention reduces the magnification factor of an image proportionate to

the drag speed of the magnifier. Dependent claims 8, 18, and 28 have been canceled without prejudice.


Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 10, and 20 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-7 and 9-10, which depend upon claim 1, claims 12-17 and 19-20, which depend upon claim 11, and claims 22-27 and 29, which depend upon claim 21 are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By


Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47, 615

Date: December 12, 2003

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
508 Second Street, Suite 201
Davis, CA 95616-4692
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665